

reducing our dependence on oil and foreign energy sources, every American will be forced to pay more and more to heat our homes and fill our gas tanks.

I went over to my office in the Hart building today. I don't get over there as much as I would like, but I went around and talked to everybody. I have a wonderful employee who has been with me for many years. Her name is Carrie. She lives in Mechanicsville, MD. When the rain hit, it took her 3 hours to get to work and 2½ hours to get home. On a normal day, it takes an hour and a half. She sold her vehicle she loved so much, which was a Chevrolet Tahoe. It would cost her \$40 every 2 days for gasoline. She bought a smaller car, and her cost for fuel has dropped significantly. Not just Carrie, but everybody in the country is more aware of the cost of energy. Whether it is for their vehicles or whether it is for their homes, the cost of oil is significant.

We are addicted to oil. That is not just me saying that. Even President Bush said it—even though I think he hasn't done anything about it. He acknowledged we are addicted to oil. I have said on the floor time and again, and I will say it again today: Today in America, we will burn 21 million barrels of oil. Tomorrow, we will use the same; the day after, the same. It is not going down, it is going up. We use 21 million barrels of oil a day. That is almost 3 gallons for every man, woman, and child in our country every day. That is enough oil, every day, to fill a swimming pool, or an oil pool, 10 feet deep, the length and width of 200 football fields—every day. How does the Earth have that much oil? But it does.

Day after day, we consume oil at twice the rate of any other industrialized nation. Our consumption only continues to go up. This oil addiction has become a three-pronged crisis: It does threaten our economy, no question about that. Look what it has done to our environment. It is threatening our national security.

A 10-percent increase in oil prices costs an estimated 150,000 Americans jobs and more than \$100 billion of American dollars.

Since 2001, oil prices have risen by more than 230 percent. So clearly these impacts are real and harmful to working families.

Those hard-working, hard-earned American dollars are coming out of the pockets of families, and where is it going? Overseas. Last year, Americans sent almost \$300 billion to foreign countries to pay for imported oil. I am not stretching the truth to say that many of those dollars went to governments that don't have our foreign policy interests at heart.

Meanwhile, the world's leading scientists have reached a consensus that the global warming crisis is real, grave, and it is growing. The Nobel Peace Prize was offered this year to, of course, Al Gore and the U.N. study group, which shared it with him, dealing with global warming.

Global warming is here. For people to write, as some do—people who are so determined to say there is no global warming, that is a figment of their imagination. It is here. Why? Because of our gluttony for oil.

Earlier this year, the House and Senate both passed a landmark, comprehensive piece of energy legislation to tackle each prong of the energy crisis. If we can finalize this and help lower prices by reducing our dependence upon oil, we would be developing renewable fuel alternatives and punishing price gougers and begin to turn the tide of global warming.

The legislation we passed was bipartisan. It wasn't just a Democratic bill. We had Republican help. I am happy to see the Presiding Officer here today because no one in recent years has done more to focus on the problems with energy than the Senator from Washington, Senator CANTWELL. Because of the strength and conviction of the Senator from Washington, who was attacked personally in her last election campaign, because she was on the right side of the issue, it didn't affect her; in fact, it probably helped her.

We have to turn the tide of global warming. Remember, we use 21 million barrels of oil a day. By increasing our CAFE standards by 2020, we can save well over a million barrels a day, and some say even more.

In our legislation, we require an additional savings of 10 million barrels a day, on average, by 2030. We set an ambitious schedule to replace about one-fifth of our petroleum consumption with renewable fuels.

At the Nevada Test Site, where we set off approximately a thousand nuclear devices—most of them underground and a few above ground—you could cover that Nevada Test Site with solar panels today, with today's technology, and supply enough electricity for the whole country. It can be done. It is not being done because we have the utilities which, in most every place in the country, are regulated monopolies. They don't want to do it because it is easier to use fossil fuel. Natural gas is expensive, so now we have a mad rush to coal.

I so appreciate that Kansas and Oklahoma, in the last couple of weeks, said: No coal. This is the area we all need to look to, the States of Kansas and Oklahoma. We should look to them as role models because they have done the right thing.

We also need more cooperation from energy companies. The utilities aren't going to do it. Last year, oil companies brought in almost \$120 billion in profits. Yet they are doing nothing to help us. The automobile industry is doing nothing to help us. Certainly, the Bush-Cheney administration—the most energy-dependent administration in history—nobody has been closer to the oil industry than this administration. They both made their fortunes in oil.

Instead, though, lobbyists for the oil, auto, and coal industries are trying

their best to weaken our bill or stop its progress. In Nevada, I came out against the coal-fired plants they are pushing there. They are spending millions of dollars in the small State of Nevada to try to show I am wrong by opposing coal-fired plants, saying: We want to build a bridge to alternative energy. Let us build a few coal-fired plants and then we will do it.

That is a lost cause. They are doing that because it is the cheapest way to do it. They could build solar plants, wind, and geothermal for no more than what it cost to build these coal-fired plants. It would be as many construction jobs, but it would be something different. If it hasn't been done before, they don't want to do it. Imagine where we would be today if they agreed to join us in this fight. We know the administration simply had secret meetings and made sweetheart deals with the oil companies, and they refused to let the press know about it. The press went to court, and the court upheld the secrecy of the White House.

The time to stand in the way of progress should be long past. Since we passed the Energy bill on a bipartisan basis, Senate Republicans have stopped us from going to conference. We cannot stop. We need to continue to work with the House to pass a bill, despite these challenges. I hope and believe Democrats and Republicans will find common ground and set a new course that will keep us safe for our economy and protect our planet.

In the Senate, our bill had something the House bill didn't. It raises CAFE standards, a renewable portfolio. It seems we ought to be able to marry the two and agree to the demand of the American people.

Today's record oil prices alone should be enough to convince us we must act quickly to complete the Energy bill and pass it into law.

---

#### RESERVATION OF LEADER TIME

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous order, the leadership time is reserved.

---

#### MORNING BUSINESS

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous order, the Senate will proceed to a period for the transaction of morning business for 90 minutes, with Senators permitted to speak therein for up to 10 minutes each, with Senator BOXER controlling the first 60 minutes, and the last 30 minutes under the control of the Republicans.

The Senator from California.

---

#### GLOBAL WARMING

Mrs. BOXER. Madam President, I have been waiting to speak to the Senate to place in the RECORD the case that we have to make to take action to ease the impact of unfettered global

warming. I think most Americans know by now—at least those who follow environmental issues—that on our committee, we have Senator INHOFE, who is the former chairman, in a very different place than the current chairman, myself. Senator INHOFE spoke for a couple of hours on this subject last week, and I told him I would come down and put forward my thoughts. I am sure he will want to respond to what I say. That is what the Senate should be. We should be able to debate. I have been looking forward to this debate because, frankly, there are very few isolated and lonely voices who keep on saying we do not have to worry about global warming. Those voices are getting fewer and fewer.

The reality is that a growing and diverse group of voices has recognized the importance of addressing global warming.

Here are a few calls to action. Some might surprise you. For example, President Bush, on September 28, said:

[Y]ears from now our children are going to look back at the choices we make today, at this deciding moment. . . .

He goes into it and says:

. . . it will be a moment when we turn the tide against greenhouse gas emissions instead of allowing the problem to grow. . . .

This is President Bush in September.

Again, some of these voices are surprising as we build our case for action in the Senate.

Gov. Charlie Crist, a Republican Governor from Florida, said:

We're all on the same planet. We need to work together to make sure the environment is an issue at the forefront. It shouldn't be a political issue. It's a global issue. It's not bipartisan. It's nonpartisan.

Certainly, in my own State, Governor Schwarzenegger and the Democrats in the legislature have worked very closely to make sure we move against unfettered global warming.

"Vatican to Become World's First Carbon-Neutral State." This is very recent, this year:

The Vatican is installing solar panels and purchasing greenhouse gas offsets to become the first carbon-neutral sovereign state.

We can see that everyone is working together except for a few. It is unfortunate because in the Senate, a few can stop us from doing our work. We already heard about some of the problems we are having getting the Energy bill through. But I am very optimistic because we have had a bipartisan breakthrough in the Environment and Public Works Committee with Senators WARNER and LIEBERMAN getting together and putting forward a very solid bill which, if it is enacted, will be the most far-reaching global warming bill in the world today.

Earlier this year, the U.S. Climate Action Partnership, known as USCAP, which includes major corporations, joined together with environmental groups to issue a call for action on global warming, calling for reductions of 60 to 80 percent in greenhouse gas emissions by 2050. I thought I would go

over some of the members of U.S. Climate Action Partnership because, again, there are just a few voices out there saying we are putting our head in the sand, this isn't a problem. But mainstream America is with the program. Let me tell my colleagues who they are. I am just going to read a few: Alcoa, Boston Scientific Corporation, BP America, Caterpillar, Inc., Chrysler, ConocoPhillips, Deere, Duke Energy, DuPont, Environmental Defense, Ford Motor Company, General Electric, General Motors, Johnson & Johnson, National Wildlife Federation, Natural Resources Defense Council, PepsiCo, Pew Center on Global Climate Change, PG&E Corporation, Shell, Siemens Corporation, Dow Chemical Company, the Nature Conservancy, World Resources Institute, and Xerox corporation.

We can see the diverse members of the American family from corporate America to environmental organizations that have gotten together and have urged us to cap greenhouse gas emissions and cut them. It is very important that we think about the amazing coalition that is out there behind us addressing global warming. When we hear some Senators come down to the floor of the Senate and say this is ridiculous, this isn't an issue, just remember this list of mainstream America urging us forward, urging us to act.

Why should so many industries be calling upon us to enact climate legislation? Because they recognize a couple of points. One, the science is strong, it is irrefutable, and a sound business future for America lies in dealing with climate change. We cannot grow, we cannot move forward if we all of a sudden turn around and our planet is under threat. We cannot have a business looking out 50 years that does not think about this. We have to think about our grandkids and our great-grandkids, and corporate America thinks about the people who are going to come forward to continue the work of that corporation. They recognize the threat, but they also recognize the opportunities.

Let's read from USCAP's call for action. It is very clear:

We believe that a national mandatory policy on climate change will provide the basis for the United States to assert world leadership in environmental and energy technology innovation, a national characteristic for which the United States has no rival. Such leadership will assure U.S. competitiveness in this century and beyond.

This is a very strong call for action from Republicans, from Democrats, from Independents, from corporate America, from the environmental community, and others that have joined together.

All you have to do, Madam President, is pick up a newspaper, any newspaper—I don't care if it is a Republican editorial board, a Democratic editorial board, or Independent—and you will see an amazing amount of evidence as to global warming and its potential im-

pact. I am going to go through a few recent headlines. I asked my staff—and they do an amazing job for me—to follow the news and let me know what is being written, what the scientists are saying. So I am going to give you just an example of some of these headlines. If we can walk away from this, then it seems to me we are being irresponsible. We have to listen to them.

Early warning signs: "Greenhouse Gases Fueled 2006 U.S. Heat." This is Reuters.

According to NOAA—

That is the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration. That is the Bush administration's NOAA—

"the annual average U.S. temperature in 2006 was 2.1 degrees Fahrenheit above the 20th century average and the ninth consecutive year of above-normal U.S. temperatures" and that this was a result of "greenhouse gas emissions—not El Nino or other natural phenomena."

This is our American Government under the President who has been very loath to move on global warming, warning us about these high temperatures.

"Scientists Report Severe Retreat of Arctic Ice."

The Cap of floating sea ice on the Arctic Ocean, which retreats under summer's warmth, this year shrank more than one million square miles—or six Californias—below the average minimum area reached in recent decades.

Again, these are scientists from the National Snow and Ice Data Center in Boulder, CO. This is not a matter of opinion; this is fact. They are measuring the ice. I was in Greenland. I saw it myself. Several of us went. It is the most awesome sight to behold, to see these icebergs, the size of a coliseum, bigger than this beautiful Senate floor, taller than this room, floating into the ocean. Each iceberg is an average of 9,000 years old, and they melt within 12 months from the time they get into the ocean. So let's not put our heads in the sand or under the water.

More early warning signs: "China Blames Climate Change for Extreme Weather." This is China. China doesn't really want to move forward. They have been slow to come to the table.

According to an official from Chinese Meteorological Administration's Department of Forecasting Services and Disaster Mitigation, "It should be said that one of the reasons for the weather extremes this year has been unusual atmospheric circulation brought about by global warming."

A lot of people around here say: Let's not do anything until the Chinese come to the table. Now the Chinese are telling us we better watch out for this global warming.

"As Sea Level Rises, Disaster Predicted for Va. Wetlands." My colleague, JOHN WARNER, was present at a very important set of hearings where we looked at the impact of global warming on his State. It says:

At least half, and perhaps as much as 80 percent, of the wetlands would be covered in too much water to survive if sea levels rise 1½ to 2 feet. The analysis was conducted by Wetlands Watch, an environmental group.

Senator WARNER and his colleagues from the DC area all came to that hearing and were very concerned.

"From Greenland to Antarctica, the world is losing its ice faster than anyone thought possible." This was in the National Geographic.

Scientists are finding that glaciers and ice sheets are surprisingly touchy. Instead of melting steadily, like an ice cube on a summer day, they are prone to feedbacks, when melting begets more melting and the ice shrinks precipitously.

This is what is happening. You can come down on this floor and you can put a blindfold over your eyes and you can put your hands over your ears and say: I see no problem, I hear no problem. Then you are not really taking in the signs.

"Fires a 'Consequence of Climate Change.'" This is touching my heart because my State has been burning, and all of my colleagues know this and all of them have been most wonderful to us—to Senator FEINSTEIN and to me—about offering help and assistance. In the long run, we need to do something about global warming or we are going to have that horrible combination of drought, low humidity, high temperatures, and terrible winds—weather extremes, Madam President, that you have experienced from time to time. This is what we are going to see. Greek Prime Minister Costas Keryman said:

The weather phenomena this year favored, as never before, the outbreak of destructive fires. We are already living with the consequences of climate change.

This gives you an idea. There are some more. "Climate Change Pollution Rising—Thanks to Overwhelmed Oceans and Plants."

This is the "Scientific American." We are not taking articles here to show you where there is bias.

The world's oceans and forests are already so full of CO<sub>2</sub> that they are losing their ability to absorb this climate change culprit.

This according to the Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences.

So, yes, someone is going to come to the floor and say: Oh, look at this great scientist, Mr. ABC, or whatever his name, and he is challenging this. Well, he is challenging the world's leading scientists. And I think it is very important to say there are always people who will say HIV doesn't cause AIDS; there are always people who will say, geez, cigarette smoking doesn't cause cancer; but thank God—thank God—this Government has followed the preponderance of the science and we now are making progress. How sad it would be if America sits on the sidelines while the whole world looks to us for leadership on global warming.

Here is this one.

"The Future Is Drying Up."

According to Nobel Laureate Steven Chu, diminished supplies of fresh water might prove a far more serious problem than slowly rising seas.

He also remarked:

"The most optimistic climate models for the second half of this century suggest that

30 to 70 percent of the snowpack will disappear."

No wonder we have people visiting our offices who are already hurting from the recreation industry in this Nation. They see what is happening. They see the handwriting on the wall. We have to act.

Here is this quote:

There's a two-thirds chance there will be a disaster, and that's in the best case scenario.

That is from a prize-winning Nobel laureate. Then this:

"Study Links CO<sub>2</sub> to Demise of Grazing Lands." From the Los Angeles Times.

Rising levels of carbon dioxide may be contributing to the conversion of the world's grasslands into a landscape of woody shrubs, much less useful for livestock grazing.

So this has implications for the very way of life we have here in America.

"Parks Face Climate Threat."

A report shows how climate change could have a huge effect on the Great Smokey Mountains, the Blue Ridge Parkway and other national parks.

This according to a new report by—by whom?—the National Parks Conservation Association.

Folks, this is mainstream thinking. Mainstream thinking. We have to act.

"Likely Spread of Deserts to Fertile Land Requires Quick Response, U.N. Report Says," New York Times.

Enough fertile land could turn into desert within the next generation to create an "environmental crisis of global proportions" based on a new U.N. report. The report warns of large-scale migrations and political instability in parts of Africa and Central Asia. The report recommends national and international action to address global warming.

Another call to action. And here, from the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change, which just won the Nobel Peace Prize, along with former Vice President Al Gore:

Projected trends in climate-change-related exposures of importance to human health will increase the number of people suffering from death, disease and injury from heatwaves, floods, storms, fires, and droughts.

So to come down here and talk about the polar bear and say the polar bear is fine—A, the polar bear is not fine, and we will talk about it; but this isn't about the polar bear. This is about God's creation that is in jeopardy. We had testimony from scientists that 40 percent of the species that were created are going to be gone. Now, it is our turn to do our part. That is why I have been working so closely with the religious community, the evangelical community. They are concerned about God's creation, and we ought to be. We talk a good game about it. We talk about values. We talk about it, so let us do something to show we are willing to protect this gift from God we have been given.

"Why Frogs Are Dying."

Climate change is no longer merely a matter of numbers from a computer model. With startling swiftness, it is reordering the natural world.

Newsweek. That is a Newsweek article.

We need scientific facts, not science fiction. In the past, we have had science fiction writers come and testify before our committee. Those days are over.

"Global Warming May Be Behind Increases in Insects and Disease-Carrying Animals," Newsday.

Rising global temperatures may be helping to spark a population boom in insects and disease-carrying animals, creating unexpected threats to human populations, a number of scientific reports say.

That is not a pretty future for my new grandson, to think about being exposed to all these vectors that have not attacked us, but this is what lies in our future if we do nothing.

"WHO—the World Health Organization—77,000 People Die Annually in Asia-Pacific Region From Climate Change." "Pollution Cutting Life Expectancy in Europe." This was in USA Today.

According to a Report by the European Environment Agency: "Poor air and water quality, and environmental changes blamed on global warming, have cut Europeans' life expectancy by nearly a year, Europe's environmental agency warned."

Well, Europe is moving forward. To be honest with you, the bills they are looking at in Europe don't quite match the bill we are looking at in the EPW Committee. That is why I am so proud of the work Senator LIEBERMAN and Senator WARNER have done, and we are only making this bill better.

"Report Calls on Europe to Move on Global Warming."

The European Commission report warns that unless there is planning, European countries will face "increasingly frequent crises and disasters which will prove much more costly and also threaten Europe's social and economic systems and its security."

The point is, when you invest now, you save \$5 later. That is a fact. We know that from Sir Nicholas Stern, who headed the World Bank.

Now, how about national security? One of the reasons I got so concerned about this is when I learned what our own Pentagon and our own intelligence people are saying to us. And what are they saying to us?

A report commissioned by the Department of Defense in 2003 found that the impacts of global warming would cause the U.S. to "find itself in a world where Europe will be struggling internally, with large numbers of refugees washing up on its shores and Asia in serious crisis over food and water. Disruptions and conflict will be endemic features of life."

And, of course, our Pentagon and our Department of Defense are very concerned about that happening with our allies in Europe.

"Warming Will Exacerbate Global Water Conflicts."

According to many studies, including the IPCC, changing weather patterns will leave millions of people without dependable supplies of water for drinking, irrigation, and power.

Now, the reason I took so much time and made all these charts—because it did take a while to get them done—is

to show the breadth and the depth of the concern in this country, in the world, to make the point that there is a huge movement in this country and in the world to address global warming. We are not going to listen to those who have their heads in the sand or, frankly, have decided they want to leave this for another generation. That would be irresponsible. I know you, Madam President, and I share a conviction that this is our job. This information has been given to us on our watch, and we intend to stand up to the challenge.

When Senator INHOFE came on the floor, he made a number of statements which were not true, and I am going to deal with a couple of them. He used an MIT report in a misleading fashion. Senator INHOFE has frequently claimed an MIT report shows the Boxer and Lieberman bills would lead to a \$4,500 tax on a family of four. But the author of the MIT report, John Reilly, said:

Senator INHOFE misread his findings. Rather than impose a tax of \$4,500 as Inhofe described it, he said, the study shows the regulation could generate a substantial amount of Federal revenue for the government to give back to Americans. A family of four, Reilly said, could earn an additional \$4,500 if the United States adopted a carbon tax or auctioned off carbon credits.

So let us not misquote authors around here, because that is not the right thing to do for them nor is it the right thing to do to mislead our colleagues.

I mentioned the polar bears before, and many of us have been touched to see the polar bears clinging to smaller and smaller pieces of ice in order to survive. Senator INHOFE has claimed—and he claimed it on the floor—that the polar bear populations are increasing.

The best-studied population, in Canada's western Hudson Bay, fell by 22 percent from 1,194 animals in 1987 to 935 in 2004, according to—who—the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service.

Our own people are telling us that the polar bear is in trouble.

The World Conservation Union projects that the bears' numbers will drop by 30 percent by 2050 due to continued loss of Arctic sea ice.

I think it is important that we talk about facts. Science must dictate what we do, not ideological arguments that don't have any weight behind them. The leading scientists of the world, including the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change, which I earlier mentioned, and which won the Nobel prize along with Vice President Gore, and the IPCC included hundreds of scientists, the best scientists from 130 nations—they tell us clearly that global warming is happening now and human activities are the cause. I believe we can meet this challenge, with hope, not fear. I believe when we meet this challenge, we will be stronger as a nation and we will be healthier as a nation.

And, by the way, we will create a whole new array of green-dollar jobs. My own State, a leader in the environment, has proven the point that when

you step out and you address the needs of the environment, what comes with it are only good things—prosperity, job creation, and healthier families. We are doing it in our State with global warming and, by the way, many other States are following. If we did nothing, it would be a shame. It would be a shame if the America we love so much stood by and said: Well, gee, let a few States go off on their own.

This is a seminal issue, and we need to do something about it, because doing nothing is not an option we can afford. The potential consequences will be devastating for our families in the future and for the world.

We are seeing the early warning signs. People can come down to this floor and say whatever they want. We have seen melting of snow, we have seen melting of permafrost, increased temperatures, warming of lakes, rivers, oceans, changing in the seasons, shifts in the ranges of plant and animal species, rising sea levels.

In the future, we can expect to see more extreme weather events, more severe heatwaves, droughts and flooding, increased storm surges and, sadly, an increased incidence of wildfires. We will see extinction of species, we will see freshwater resources at risk. By 2020, between 75 million and 250 million people will be exposed to increased water stress due to climate change in Africa.

In Asia there will be problems. Warming in the western mountains of America is projected to cause decreased snowpack and reduced summer flows, resulting in even greater competition for already overallocated water resources.

I mentioned this figure before—we did hold 20 hearings on global warming. At one of them, we had scientists who were experts on wildlife. I remember sitting there, being so saddened to hear that if we do nothing, 40 percent of God's species on planet Earth could face extinction.

Now we hear our oceans are at risk as well. The British Royal Society projects that progressive acidification of oceans due to increasing carbon dioxide is expected to have terrible impacts on marine life, such as corals and their dependent species. You have heard of coral bleaching. It is caused by increased water temperatures as well as the oceans becoming acidic from storing excess carbon. The water becomes so acidic some marine life, such as shellfish and coral reefs, can no longer form their shell, as it dissolves in the acidic water.

The IPCC found that pests, diseases, and fire are having terrible impacts on forests, with an extended period of high fire risk and large increases in areas burned. Again, I wish to use this moment to thank the firefighters in my State, all of them—local, State, Federal—working seamlessly together. We have the most extraordinary heroic firefighters in California, as we do all over this country. Their jobs are be-

coming more and more dangerous as these fires are so strong and are fueled by droughts, high temperatures, low humidity, and high winds.

I mentioned before that in July, I was in Greenland. I was there with 10 Senators and Dr. Richard Alley, an expert on ice from Penn State, who accompanied us on the trip. It was amazing to see this whole situation with him at my side. What I learned from him is Greenland's ice is melting faster than anyone thought. In some places, the glacier ice is moving so quickly, if you stand there you can actually observe it moving.

In the past year, new islands were discovered that were previously connected to the main mass of ice. The Greenland ice sheet holds enough ice to raise sea levels globally by 23 feet. Think about 23 feet. Sea level increases of only a few feet will cause major disruptions.

I wish to talk about public health. Public health officials have issued a call to action. We had a hearing the other day and we heard from the Director of the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention. Unfortunately, her testimony was heavily edited by the White House. I am working very hard, with other colleagues, to get her original draft. Let me tell you, we are not going to rest until we get that. But the fact is the public has a right to know everything about global warming and the threat it poses to their families and to their communities.

At the same hearing where we heard from Dr. Gerberding, the Commissioner of the Tennessee Department of Health presented the committee with a position statement from the Association of State and Territorial Health Officials on Climate Change and Public Health. Their statement was adopted unanimously.

Yes, if a Senator wants to come down here and condemn all the public health officials in the country and claim they get some benefit out of this, let the Senator do it. The fact is, they have said they support the latest findings of the U.N., and they recognize that climate change has far-reaching implications for public health.

According to the IPCC, climate change has already altered the distribution of some infectious disease vectors and the seasonal distribution of some allergenic pollen and increased heat wave-related deaths.

We are already seeing and we are already feeling the difference. If trends continue, we could see increased malnutrition and related disorders, including those related to child growth and development. We will see increases in the number of people suffering from disease, injury, death because of heat waves and because of droughts and fires and all the things we mentioned.

The World Health Organization has estimated that human-induced changes in the Earth's climate lead to at least 5 million cases of illness and more than 150,000 deaths every year already.

We saw the European heat wave which caused countless numbers of illnesses and claimed 35,000 lives. That is accurate—35,000 lives were lost.

You can come down to this floor and you can say everything is beautiful, but you are not in touch with reality.

We are beginning to see right here in America what happens when the water warms. The Associated Press reported on September 27 that a 14-year-old boy died from an infection caused by an amoeba after swimming in Lake Havasu. According to a CDC official, these amebas thrive in warm water and as water temperatures continue to rise, we can expect to see more cases of these amoeba infections.

We are going to see an increase of ground-level ozone or smog because that is formed at higher temperatures. We know smog damages lungs and can cause asthma in our kids. We already have asthma as the leading cause of school absences in my State. I cannot speak for other States, but we have major problems with dangerous smog days.

We know about wildlife. We know, as I said, that 40 percent of the species are at risk of extinction if we do nothing to reduce global warming. The U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service concluded that shrinking sea ice is the primary cause for the decline in polar bear populations. Senator INHOFE comes down and says the polar bears are doing great: Wrong. False information. Listen to your own administration's U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service. The shrinking sea ice is the primary cause for the decline in polar bear populations.

Guess what. This administration—because it was threatened by a lawsuit—proposed listing the polar bear as threatened under the Endangered Species Act. So come down here and show pictures of those magnificent polar bears, saying everything is fine—that is wrong. It is wrong by every measure, by every scientific account, by our own U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service.

Global warming is a national security issue, as I mentioned before. People are telling me this current humanitarian catastrophe in Darfur is already linked to the extended drought in the region. The Secretary General of the United Nations said the Darfur conflict began as an ecological crisis, arising at least in part from climate change. This is happening right under our nose. The Senate and the House have been asleep at the wheel—until recently.

A report commissioned by the Department of Defense found the impacts of global warming would cause the United States to “find itself in a world where Europe would be struggling. . . .” Projected global warming “poses a serious threat to America’s national security” and “acts as a threat multiplier for instability. . . .” This is all from retired admirals and generals. This is not from BARBARA BOXER. This isn’t from Al Gore. This isn’t from MARIA CANTWELL. This isn’t from Senator WARNER. It isn’t from Senator

LIEBERMAN. This is from our own retired admirals and generals: Projected global warming poses a serious threat to America’s national security.

The United States, they said, could more frequently be drawn into situations of conflict “to help provide stability before conditions worsen and are exploited by extremists.” Such missions could be long and require the United States to remain for “stability and reconstruction efforts . . . to avert further disaster.”

That report also warns of “extreme weather events, drought, flooding, sea level rise, retreating glaciers, habitat shifts . . . the increased spread of life-threatening diseases” and increased scarcity of clean water that could “result in multiple chronic conditions” and “foster the conditions for internal conflicts, extremism, and movement toward increased authoritarianism and radical ideologies.”

I have never seen an issue such as this, where we have such a unanimous call for action, a unanimous call for action—from the business community, from environmental organizations, from admirals and generals, from the Department of Defense, from the Wildlife Service—from all over the world. As yet we are nowhere, but we hope to change that.

What are our States and our local governments saying? They are taking action.

I have had the pleasure of having Mayor Gregg Nickels of Seattle before the Committee. He started the Mayors’ Climate Protection Agreement in 2005. To date, mayors from nearly 700 cities across America, representing 75 million Americans, have pledged to reduce their greenhouse gas emissions.

So come down to the floor and say what you want. But 75 million Americans are already acting. Come to the floor, say what you want, but the world is passing you by if you close your ears, cover your eyes, and convince yourself that you know more than the scientists of the world know.

California is the sixth largest economy of the world. I am so proud to represent California—37 million people and a spirit of entrepreneurship, a spirit of neighbor helping neighbor. It is an incredible place.

California has set the gold standard with its landmark global warming program, Republican Governor Schwarzenegger and a Democratic legislature setting us on a clear path toward 80 percent cuts by 2050.

You know, what is important about the California experience is look at what we have already done on per-capita energy use. I am so honored that you are in the chair, Madam President, because of your expertise on energy.

We have kept our per-capita energy use steady for more than 30 years, while per-capita energy consumption in the rest of the Nation has doubled. If the whole country could have been as efficient as California, we would have saved an amount of energy equivalent

to all the oil we import from the Middle East each year. Can you imagine that? So when people fight against doing something about global warming, I say: If you look at the low-hanging fruit, which is energy efficiency, and look at what my State has done and now other States are doing, we can get halfway there without one sacrifice.

I don’t think anyone has ever said that Californians do not lead a very happy, pleasant life. I don’t think anyone looks at Californians: Oh, those poor people, they are so unhappy because they are energy efficient.

On the contrary, we have a booming economy and we have people who are feeling good about themselves because of the contribution they have made. It does not take much to get a refrigerator that is more efficient or get a car that gets better mileage or get an air-conditioner that cuts your energy use in half. I have done it. I have done these things. I am saving money. I am driving my Prius, and I am waving to the gas station because I don’t have to go in very often to fill up my car.

People all over this country are already so far ahead of where we are. If you want to come down to the floor, if you want to take issue with 75 million Americans, be my guest. But you are not being honest with the facts. The facts are clear.

Twenty-nine States have completed climate action plans and a number of States have established mandatory reduction targets, again including my home State. Last week, Gov. Kathleen Sibelius of Kansas wrote an open letter to the people of her State, expressing her support for clean energy. What is happening in Kansas? Good things. The State’s environment secretary rejected applications to build two new coal-fired powerplants. They want cleaner energy. They want clean energy. They see they are going to move in that direction. The Governor of Kansas understands what we are facing. If you want to come down on the floor and tell her she is wrong, be my guest. It is a free country. But you know what? You are not going to change her mind and you are not going to change the minds in so many States that are moving so far past us it makes your head spin.

Addressing global warming has major benefits. I have given you the truth about the dangers of global warming because a lot of people walk away. I wanted you to hear the truth about the dangers of global warming. Now I want to tell you what gives me hope. When we step up to the plate, we are going to benefit. We cannot only prevent the most dangerous effects of climate change, but we are going to be better off for it. I already mentioned Sir Nicholas Stern, former chief economist of the World Bank. He said: Spend a dollar now, save \$5 later. So people are going to come on the floor and they are going to say: Oh my God, they are spending money on this.

No, we are going to save money, because if we can avert the worst problems of global warming—you can’t

build a flood protection tall enough unless we do something now. Do you know what it costs to build that flood protection? We know because we passed the Water Resources Protection Act and we kept our promises to the people of New Orleans and the others from Katrina and Rita who suffered so much.

To take a little segue, the President is threatening to veto that bill. Now, that is one where Senator INHOFE and I are exactly together. We cannot walk away from building an infrastructure, but the point is, building an infrastructure to protect against the type of floods that could come if we do not act is going to be so much more expensive than investing the dollars now. And that is the point.

Since 1990, Britain has reduced its greenhouse gas emissions by 15 percent. Guess what. Britain's economy has grown 40 percent. So people can come down to this floor and say: Oh, it is going to wreck our economy. Wrong again. It did not happen in California; it did not happen in Britain.

Britain's environmental industries are the fastest growing sector of the country's economy. I was just there a couple of months ago. They are so excited. Their environmental jobs grew to 500,000 from 135,000 in just the last 5 years.

There is a study at UC Berkeley, University of California, Berkeley. They say that the State product in California, the gross State product, by 2020 will be up by as much as \$74 billion, with 89,000 new jobs created because of our work on global warming and our laws.

I have been to Silicon Valley. You are familiar with the entrepreneurial spirit there. They are just waiting to make the kind of investments necessary, but they need to have a clue as to what we are going to do. If we walk away from a cap-and-trade system, which will put a market price on carbon, they are not going to make those investments.

The entrepreneurs in Silicon Valley are on the cutting edge. New companies are starting every day to respond to the growing demand for clean energy and more efficient vehicles and other technologies.

Sun Microsystems is already reaping the benefits of greater efficiency. I just went to visit Sun Microsystems. They made some simple changes in the way they cool their computer servers. They have been able to cut their electrical consumption in half. I will tell you, simple things can save so much energy. Simple things can cut down on global warming.

Tesla Motors, I would urge all of you to follow that company. They are producing an all-electric car with performance that rivals or even exceeds the world's best sports cars. It is exciting. It is in production. It is all electric.

Ms. CANTWELL. Will the Senator yield?

Mrs. BOXER. I will yield to the Senator from Washington.

Ms. CANTWELL. First, I compliment the Senator for her very articulate understanding of the impact of greenhouse gases and where our country needs to go. So thank you for your leadership. We are so happy that you are chairing that committee and showing the fortitude to make sure this legislation starts moving through the Senate.

You mentioned California's experience. I wonder if you would just elaborate on that one more time because I think the point may have been—it sounds so simple but yet so complex. California's savings is what we are trying to do in the Energy bill. Here we have a 20-percent reduction of fuel consumption and a 20-percent reduction of greenhouse gases. That is why we need to pass the Energy bill. But you are talking about California's efficiency, and the efficiency that it achieved was monumental and significant. If you would, emphasize or explain how it is that we should be doing the same thing in the Senate in moving forward on efficiency.

Mrs. BOXER. I thank my dear friend, such a great leader on energy reform, for taking to the floor. I want to say to you, Senator CANTWELL, in California we have kept our per capita energy use steady. In other words, each person's energy use over time has stayed steady for more than 30 years, while the per capita energy use in the rest of the Nation doubled.

Now, we have done it in ways that were very comfortable for people. You know, you look at the energy for appliances, you look at building codes, you look at all the things that we have done, simple things, things you are trying to do in the Energy bill.

Ms. CANTWELL. Madam Chair, did that cost California jobs?

Mrs. BOXER. It created jobs. We have been a leader in jobs. We are very prosperous. We believe our landmark legislation on global warming, the studies show, will create thousands and tens of thousands of green-collar jobs.

I think the point I would like to emphasize, and I know my friend from Missouri will be amazed at this, if every other State were just to emulate that, had emulated that, and we all did this as a national goal, not just one State's goal, we would have saved an amount of energy equivalent to all of the oil we import from the Middle East each year.

That is the amount of savings from the simple things that we can do, some of the things that my friend is trying so hard to get done in the Energy bill.

The fact is, when I look at the whole issue of global warming as a good news/bad news story, the bad news is we really have not tackled it here. The good news is there is so much we can do, so easily, with such benefits.

Certainly, energy efficiency is one.

Ms. CANTWELL. Madam Chair, I thank the Senator from California for answering that question and again for her great leadership on trying to push

forward global warming and climate impact legislation in the Senate.

We do have to move forward. Her re-siliency in saying the committee will address it, the committee will mark up legislation is the next step in what we need to do in following through. I applaud her for her dedication and for answering that question.

At \$90 a barrel for oil, I certainly wish the rest of the Nation would have followed what California has done in that consumption reduction because it would have helped all of us on today's oil prices.

Mrs. BOXER. Madam President, how much time do I have remaining?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mrs. MCCASKILL). The Senator has 9 minutes remaining.

Mrs. BOXER. Thank you very much. I would just say that the California story is a good news story. California is trying to do more. They have asked the Bush administration for a waiver to move forward in the transportation sector. That waiver has not been forthcoming.

California has gotten 50 waivers in the past. For some reason now there has been a very slow-walking act that has gone along with this request for a waiver. I am hoping that our committee is going to invite many of the Governors of the various States to the Capitol to talk about why it is so key for the Bush administration to grant the waiver.

When I started to talk about what is happening now with the entrepreneurial spirit in my State, I talked about Sun Microsystems reaping the benefits of energy efficiency to their plant.

First of all, they were able to consolidate the space that houses all of their computers, which was a big help. Secondly, just by moving forward with a new way to cool their computers, cool their computers in a low-energy way, they cut their energy bills in half.

I talked about Tesla Motors producing an all-electric car. It is a beautiful car. They are not marketing it as a way to fight global warming. They are marketing it as a beautiful car, one of the fastest cars in the world.

Tesla Motors, I hope you will go and take a look. Their first model is going to be very expensive, we know that. But their next models are going to be half the price. And they hope in the future to get to the \$30,000 range. Now, what we are talking about is clean automobiles, zero emissions of greenhouse gases.

There is another company, Bloom Energy, in San Jose. They are creating the next generation of fuel cell electrical generation systems. I visited there and the scientists were explaining how all of this works. I can tell you this technology has the potential to revolutionize the way that electricity is generated. It holds the potential to bring clean electricity to parts of the world that have no electricity now.

So what are the benefits, the benefits of new technology? New jobs, cleaner

air as we reduce the pollution that causes global warming, by increasing our use of clean, renewable energy sources such as wind and solar, driving more efficiently, less polluting cars and trucks, and increasing efficiency. We will reduce other forms of air pollution too: sulphur dioxide, nitrogen oxides, mercury.

These are issues about which Senators CARPER and ALEXANDER are very concerned. They sit on the Environment and Public Works Committee. With this bill we will see that those pollutants will be reduced as we cut global warming pollution. And that means cleaner, healthier air for us all to breathe.

Now, the IPCC also concluded that household benefits from reduced air pollution as a result of action to reduce greenhouse gas emissions can be substantial. So when I say: I meet this crisis with hope, not fear, I mean it. I think it is going to create jobs. I think it is going to make our communities healthier. I think it is going to make our air healthier. I think it is going to reduce our dependence on foreign countries to supply oil, which is now up to \$90 a barrel.

We know oil is a critical strategic interest of America. Our reliance on oil-rich rogue states and unstable regimes has been at the heart of wars and interventions in the Middle East. As we develop these clean, renewable sources of energy, which is all going to be done by the private sector, my venture capitalists at home cannot wait to make these investments, but they will not make them unless we take the lead on a strong anti-global-warming bill.

Now, world leadership, the United States has always been the world leader on environmental protection. The core environmental laws that we created and enacted, most of them through the committee on which I am so proud to be a part of, the Clean Water Act, the Clean Air Act, Safe Drinking Water Act, National Environmental Policy Act, and others, have been models for environmental policy around the globe. The global warming legislation we pass will take its place alongside those landmark laws. It is time for us to step up and set the pace.

Now, again, our States are doing it. I want our States to continue. I really do. But I really do believe this is an issue that belongs in the Senate. By leading now, we can ensure that the solutions to global warming are designed in ways that are good for America, good for our businesses, good for our consumers, good for our kids. We have the technology and know-how to export. Now is the time to move forward.

Well, I have been working very closely with Senators WARNER and LIEBERMAN as they have assembled their bill. I was so impressed with the effort they have invested in seeking out the views of Senators and other groups, environmental organizations, business organizations.

They have looked at all the other global warming bills that have been

proposed: the Sanders-Boxer bill, the Kerry-Snowe bill. They have looked at the Lieberman-McCain bill and the Bingaman bill. I think those are all of them. There has been a broad range of views that they have reconciled in the process. I have laid out some important principles that I believe must be reflected in the legislation. Any bill has to have the emission reductions that will avoid dangerous climate change. It must be flexible to have look-back, to make sure we are on course. We need an emissions trading program so there is a price put on carbon by the private sector. We must protect the pioneering State efforts that are already underway. We need to ensure that other countries are stepping up and doing what they have to do. There are ways to enforce that, frankly, because a lot of folks want to trade with us. If they want to come in and trade with us, they better make sure they are not adding to this problem.

Natural resources and wildlife concerns must be addressed. We must support American workers in their transition as we move to a greener economy and see, again, as they have in Great Britain, how many jobs would be created.

I also want to express the moral imperative that was really brought to me by the religious community. The most vulnerable here and around the world have to be protected. I know we have colleagues who continue to say we have to do it, and they are absolutely right.

There is no time to waste because the longer we wait, the harder it will be to achieve the goals we have to achieve—before we find we are spending a fortune on flood control and we are spending a fortune to try to mitigate the terrible ravages that global warming will bring.

The point is, with good legislation we have these lookbacks. If we are on target, fine. If we are doing too much, we have a way to back off. If we are not doing enough, we could do more. That is the beauty of the Lieberman-Warner bill.

I believe there is unprecedented momentum for change. Yes, you are going to have a few voices come down here and say this is ridiculous, this does not make any sense. That is fine. That is their right. But, again, in every great issues debate, you always have a few people who stand outside the mainstream, and I respect that. I absolutely give the folks who have that point of view all the time they want to express themselves.

But the bill Senators Warner and Lieberman have crafted can set us on the path to achieving the goal of avoiding dangerous climate change. It is a bipartisan, mainstream breakthrough, and I am committed to further strengthening this legislation as we move forward because the legislation establishes a framework on which we can build. It embodies key concepts—such as cap and trade and lookbacks and it draws on the other strong global

warming bills that have been proposed. It gets us started. Time is short.

Now, there are a few who will say we should not do anything.

Madam President, I ask unanimous consent for 60 seconds.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mrs. BOXER. I thank my friends for yielding me that 60 seconds because what I want to do is wrap up.

Some will say: This is not an urgent problem. Do nothing.

Others will say: Do nothing until you go to the extreme, until you go to the 90-percent cut. Let's wait for a new President. Let's wait for a new Congress. Let's wait for a new day. Let's wait for the Sun to come out. Let's wait for the rain to fall.

I do not ascribe to either of those extremes.

We have the facts now. We have a good bill now. We have an unprecedented opportunity to send a signal to this country and to the world that we are ready, finally, to move to calm the effects of unfettered global warming. I think we can do it. I think we can be successful at it, and I do approach this with great hope.

Some have tried to argue that we should not act now. These people say we should wait for a new President, a new Congress, another day.

As I say, there is no time to waste. Right now, there is unprecedented momentum for change. We must harness that momentum to pass strong global warming legislation. We have a small window of time to get started down this path. The longer we wait to get started, the harder it will be to achieve the emissions reductions we know we need to reach. Starting now will send a signal to the world and the business community as they make their future plans that the United States is serious about its leadership role.

Some have asked me, Why should we pass legislation now, when the President has said he is opposed to mandatory caps on global warming pollution and a cap-and-trade system?

The President and I agree that technology is the solution. But he still won't accept that it won't happen on its own, not unless the price of carbon is built into the process. We still hope to change his mind, but even if we do not, we must begin the hard work of the legislative process. It takes time, patience, fortitude, and courage. Very few laws are passed the first time around. We must take good legislation as far as we can. It is our job to start down the path.

I have a vision for my 11-year-old grandson and for my new grandson who was born a few months ago.

My vision is that these children and yours will grow up and be able to know the gifts of nature that we saved for them, that they will understand we made the right choice for them—we protected the planet that is their home—that because of our action they

will not be shackled into fighting wars over the last drops of water or oil or remaining acres of arable cropland. They will not have to spend their last treasure building higher flood walls, bigger levees, and fortified cities to escape rising seas and angrier hurricanes.

Their cars will run on clean renewable fuels that do not pollute the air they breathe. The United States will lead in exporting clean technologies and products that are the engine of a new green economy. We will lead the world in showing the way to live well, in a way that respects the Earth.

To make this vision a reality, we must face our challenge in a way that overcomes our differences, and that defies our party affiliations.

Madam President, I yield the floor to my friend, Senator INHOFE.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oklahoma.

Mr. INHOFE. Thank you, Madam President. It is my understanding—I would ask for clarification—I am entitled to 30 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Republicans control the remaining 30 minutes of morning business.

Mr. INHOFE. Thank you very much.

#### GLOBAL WARMING

Mr. INHOFE. Madam President, let me, first of all, say it would be very difficult to, in only 30 minutes, refute everything that was just said. Interestingly enough, I was honored to have about 2 hours 10 minutes on the floor last Friday to tell the truth about this subject of global warming. I have had a chance to do that. I have very carefully written down all the points that were made by my good friend from California, and I am going to try to get through these as quickly as I can within that 30-minute period of time.

First of all, on the wildfires in California—this is interesting because everything that is out there that is distasteful is blamed on global warming. People say: Oh, it must be true; that is what I read in the newspapers.

I believed, 4½ years ago, it was true. We all know that the Northern Hemisphere has been going through a period—up until about 7 years ago—where it was warming. That has stopped. But it was true at that time. So I assumed it had something to do with manmade gases until we started looking at it and realizing the science just isn't there.

On wildfires out in California, just real quickly, it is interesting, the Los Angeles Times headline was "Global warming not a factor in wildfires." An excerpt from the article reads: Are the massive fires burning across southern California a product of global warming? They say no. Scientists—almost unanimously—say that has nothing to do with it.

In fact, it is kind of interesting; it is reported: The Santa Ana winds, which typically have gusts of up to 45 miles per hour, were recorded at more than

80 miles per hour several times this week—strong but inside the range of normal variability.

Meteorologist Joseph D'Aleo said this past Friday:

The unfortunate fires can be explained very nicely by natural factors.

Environmentalists would not allow brush clearing. He goes on to talk about the prohibition against clearing up accumulated brush from the areas surrounding housing developments that was instituted at the insistence of the Sierra Club and other environmental organizations.

Climatologist Patrick Michaels debunks the wildfire-global warming link. Do not blame this on global warming. There is no trend whatsoever in the frequency of heavy-rainfall years and so forth. He goes on and on. So that just flat is not true.

Now, the Senator from California has claimed, on several occasions, it would be cheaper in the long run to immediately enact regulatory policies aimed at controlling the Earth's global temperatures. The claim is clearly wrong. Of the half dozen major bills introduced in the Senate, all will harm the economy, yet none will put a dent in global warming, even if the worst fears were well founded.

Earlier this month, the Environmental Protection Agency concluded that over the long run each bill before Congress, including those that would reduce U.S. emissions by 70 percent—70 percent—would only reduce global concentration of greenhouse gases by 4 percent—just 4 percent.

Here is something that is interesting. When former Vice President Al Gore was in office, he went to Tom Wigley, who at that time was a very renowned scientist and one of his top advisers. He said: What would happen if all developed nations—not the developing nations such as China and other countries where they do not have any control over what can be done there, but if developed nations all signed on to the Kyoto treaty and lived by their emissions, how much would it reduce the Earth's temperature in 50 years? The result was 0.07 degrees Celsius. Now, that is if everybody did this and inflicted all the damage.

In June of this year, China—this is something which is kind of interesting; they try to blame America and our emissions on greenhouse gases—they were projecting we would be the No. 1 greenhouse gas emitter by 2040. We were shocked to find out that just recently China already passed us. So they are increasing their emissions of greenhouse gases at a real rapid rate. As a matter of fact, we went through the 15 years prior to 2005 by having no new coal-fired generating plants. China is now cranking out one every 3 days. This is kind of interesting because as we lose jobs to China, because we do not have the energy here, they are going to be using technologies that are not nearly as ecologically refined as ours. So it is going to end up having

the effect of even more and more greenhouse gases.

Now, when Time magazine named the Model T Ford the 20th century's worst environmental product because it brought mobility and prosperity, it was clear that common sense has been turned on its head in this country. Almost a century ago, when the first Model T was rolling off the assembly line, the average American could expect a lifespan of 53 years and an inflation-adjusted income of only \$5,300 a year. Now that the automobile is here and we can take people long distances—to hospitals and that type of thing—we are now looking at an average lifespan at 78 years as opposed to 53 years and an annual income, adjusted for inflation, of \$32,000. Yet, despite this, some are still making the claim it will not be all that harmful to the economy to take drastic action in trying to do something about this. They keep insisting that China and other countries will mimic us. I think it is pretty reasonable that when China's Deputy Director General for Environmental Affairs makes such uncompromising, clear statements of China's policies to pursue an economic growth agenda first and foremost, we would be wise to take him at his word.

Adopting these policies will only cost the country trillions of dollars over time on the naive belief that if China sees how serious our country is, it will decide, in the goodness of its heart, to do this. This is just not right. They made it very clear they do not have any interest in doing that at all.

Now, when we talk about the Kyoto protocol—which is the first one that came along—I think it is interesting that of all 15 Western European countries that joined the Kyoto protocol, only 2 out of 15 have lived within the emissions, have emitted the amounts that were acceptable by the protocol. One of those is Great Britain, and right now they are increasing their emissions of greenhouse gases.

The facts above may be what prompted the journal Nature to publish an article declaring that Kyoto is dead and that we need a new approach, one remarkably similar to the Bush approach, and that is the Asian Pacific Partnership Act, which I talked about for quite a while last Friday, which I will not repeat now.

The Senator from California relied on the 2006 Stern report from Britain to bolster her claim. Senator BOXER stated:

This is a very important moment in time. The cost of doing nothing, according to the leading economist on this topic in the world, Nicholas Stern, is five times what the cost will be to address this issue now.

Now, I do think this is worth spending a little bit of time on because my good friend, the junior Senator from California, spent quite a bit of time on this subject.

What did the experts say about the Stern report?

Economist Richard Tol of Hamburg University, one of the world's leading